

Glenda Wiles

From: gary zebrowski [gpzebrowski@msn.com]
Sent: Friday, May 16, 2008 7:30 AM
To: Glenda Wiles
Cc: gpzebrowski@msn.com
Subject: County zoning - our input

My wife and I, both registered and active voters and landowners, are against the aggressive zoning requirements the Commissioners are currently pursuing.

1. The current zoning (Plan B) goes way beyond usage, which would have been a more moderate first step in county-wide zoning.
2. There appear to be quite a few areas in Plan B that are not legal, and certainly will be challenged in court (a needless cost the county cannot absorb – especially under the budget constraints we face)
3. Property rights, which are very important to Montanan's, are grossly diminished by the current plan.
4. The Commissioners appear to be marching down this path without the agreement of the citizens, and minimally, the final zoning plan should go before the people via the voting booth.
5. Special interest groups appear to be leading the way towards the zoning as currently outlined in Plan B. That is as fundamentally wrong in local government, as it is in federal government. The loudest, and strongest, special interest groups appear to want to stop growth in the valley, and the zoning as currently outlined reflect this by the aggressive zoning regulations and restrictive nature of any development as outlined in Plan B.
6. Plan B does have some conflict with the growth plan. All a negative conflict.
7. The current zoning plan implies additional fees that will cost the property owner more money. It is another restriction imposed by the zoning plan at the expense of the people who live here.
8. Many land-owners who have been here for generations, have no 401K -- they own land. Selling their land is a key to their retirement survival. The current zoning plan makes it very difficult, if not impossible, for these long-time family Montanan's, the option to sell their property so they can afford retirement. That is a shameful impact on these people.
9. Current zoning plan does not help beautify the valley. It does not address simple requirements for businesses operating in the valley: Outlining signage requirements, landscaping, ingress/egress, etc., which would make the 93-corridor more attractive, and safer, if zoning requirements addressed these areas.
10. Other communities that have zoning reveal that after the initial zoning regulations are established, zoning requirements grow over time and become even more cumbersome for the residents. Starting our zoning plans so aggressive leaps us into a very restrictive mode at the onset. Yet it too will grow over time like other historical zoning has across the country. We need to remember that zoning is for the benefit of the residents, not to restrict their rights or their opportunities, nor to appease a minority supported by wealthy and very active special interest groups. As our representatives, voted in by the county citizens, it is important not to forget this.

Our desire is that the county step-back, and take a more modest first step to zoning the valley. Make the first step more palatable to the residents rather than pushing a much too aggressive county-wide zoning plan as currently outlined. We appreciate an email response from each of the commissioners addressing our zoning desires. Regards, Gary Zebrowski and Michele Horsley.